

REMARKS

The Examiner has rejected claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 112 Second Paragraph as being indefinite for lack of proper antecedent basis. Claim 1 has been amended to substitute the word “a” for the word “the” in the quoted sentence. It is believed that this amendment should correct the problem, particularly since line 3 of claim 1 provides proper support.

The Examiner indicated that claims 4, 6, 9, 14, 29, 35, 49, and 50 would be held allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the respective base claim and any intervening claims. As will be discussed below, the amendment submitted with this Response does exactly as the Examiner has suggested and thus all of the claims are now believed to be allowable.

Note that as discussed in a telephone call with the Examiner, it is also believed that claim 48, which was lumped with claims 8 and 33 should be held allowable because the recitation of claim 48 is different for the recitations of claims 8 and 33. In the interview, the Examiner agreed that he inadvertently put claim 48 with claims 8 and 33. Accordingly, claim 48 has been combined with its base claim 44 and thus claim 44 should be held allowable.

Also as discussed in the telephone interview, Applicant has amended claim 19 to incorporate therein the concept of a video message. This is in keeping with the incorporation of claim 4 into claim 1 and thus, as amended, claim 19 is believed to be allowable.

Summary of the claims as amended

Claim 1 has been amended to include the limitation of claims 2 and 4 (which the Examiner said would be allowable if incorporated into the base claim). Claims 5 through 18 depend from claim 1 and thus also should be held allowable.

Claim 19 has been amended, as discussed above, to incorporate the concept of displaying video messages. This is similar to claim 1, as amended and thus should be held allowable. Claims 20 through 27 depend from claim 19 and thus should be held allowable.

Claim 28 has been amended to include the limitation of claim 29 (which the Examiner said would be allowable if incorporated into the base claim). Claim 29 has been canceled. Claims 30 through 36 depend from claim 28 and thus also should be held allowable.

Claim 44 has been amended to include the limitation of claim 49 (which the Examiner said would be allowable if incorporated into the base claim). Claim 49 has been canceled. Claim 48, and claims 50 and 51 depend from claim 44 and thus also should be held allowable.

New claim 52 has been added to combine the limitations of claims 1 and 6 (which the Examiner said would be allowable if incorporated into the base claim). Claims 53 through 62 depend from claim 52 and thus also should be held allowable.

New claim 63 has been added to combine the limitations of claims 1 and 9 (which the Examiner said would be allowable if incorporated into the base claim). Claims 64 through 67 depend from claim 63 and thus also should be held allowable.

New claim 68 has been added to combine the limitations of claims 1 and 14 (which the Examiner said would be allowable if incorporated into the base claim). Claims 69 through 77 depend from claim 68 and thus also should be held allowable.

New claim 78 has been added to combine the limitations of claims 28 and 35 (which the Examiner said would be allowable if incorporated into the base claim). Claims 79 through 83 depend from claim 78 and thus also should be held allowable.

New claim 84 has been added to combine the limitations of claims 44 and 50 (which the Examiner said would be allowable if incorporated into the base claim). Claims 85 through 87 depend from claim 84 and thus also should be held allowable.

New claim 88 has been added to combine the limitations of claims 44 and 48 (which, as discussed above, it is believed the Examiner intended to allow if incorporated into the base claim.) Claims 89 through 91 depend from claim 88 and thus also should be held allowable.

In view of the above, Applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance. The fee required for the added claims was dealt with in the response filed December 12, 2006. If any additional fee is due, please charge deposit Account No. 06-2380, under Order No. 05708/P010US/08008819 from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

Dated: February 6, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By 

David H. Tannenbaum

Registration No.: 24,745

FULBRIGHT & JAWORSKI L.L.P.

2200 Ross Avenue, Suite 2800

Dallas, Texas 75201-2784

(214) 855-8333

(214) 855-8200 (Fax)

Attorney for Applicant